UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Contributors to this Issue:

Joseph Ernest McAfee
John Haynes Holmes
Curtis W. Reese
Edwin D. Mead
Brent Dow Allinson
E. Guy Talbot
Taraknath Das
Joseph Southall
Don Carlos
Eliot White
Jerome Alexander
William Pickens

VOLUME CXV NUMBER 5

Chicago, May 6, 1935

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly — *Subscription $3.00*

Until Further Notice — *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter November 15, 1933, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* — CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY
JAMES H. WEST

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 83
Stubborn Fallacies—JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE 86
Jottings—J. H. H. 87
ARTICLES—
Unitarianism: Background and Foreground—CURTIS W. REESE. 87
Memories of William T. Stead (Concluded)—EDWIN D. MEAD 92
Will the Senate Put the War Department on Trial?—BRENT DOW ALLINSON 93
American-Japanese Relations—E. GUY TALBOT 95
The Disalcohol Conference—JOSEPH SOUTHALL 96
POETRY—
The Son of Man—*Rabindranath Tagore* 83
"May Day"—DON CARLOS 91
The Scarlet Sage—ELIOT WHITE 96
Faith—JEROME ALEXANDER 100
THE STUDY TABLE—
Indian Nationalist Opposition to Imperial Preference in India.—TARAKNATH DAS 97
"The Woman Without a Country"—CURTIS W. REESE 98
CORRESPONDENCE—
Prevent War With Japan—PEACE PATRIOTS 98
Scottsboro Decision Does Not Degrade Jury System—WILLIAM PICKENS 98
THE FIELD—
An Open Letter to the People of Japan 82
The Churches on War—Unemployment—and a New Social Order—(Concluded) 99
Free America—*Zion Herald* 99
Religious Liberty in Mexico Petition Signed by 500 Clergymen. 100

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

An Open Letter To the People of Japan

In the name of peace we greet you, our brothers and sisters in Japan. For eighty-one years our two nations have maintained friendly relations. During this time each country has developed in parallel growth the strength and wealth of modern statehood. The broad expanse of the Pacific Ocean has become a highway on which the mighty commerce between yourselves and us is carried without danger. The great germinal ideas of our basic world culture move freely between the two nations. Through the miracles of modern communication the years have united our two peoples more firmly in the bonds of universal brotherhood.

We write this letter of good will at this time because this cherished bond might be menaced by a plan announced by our government which we regard as highly unimaginative and mistaken. We refer to the decision of the Navy Department of the United States to hold maneuvers of a large fleet in the North Pacific during the month of May. While these maneuvers may have been ordered simply as part of the routine idea of naval men to exercise the fleet from time to time in such ways as will promote its technical efficiency, we are strongly opposed to this move because no matter how honestly meant to be without offense to any other nation, such maneuvers will hardly escape misinterpretation by sensation-mongers and individuals in each nation who are in position to profit from the creation of fear and suspicion. We desire to convey to you, therefore, the knowledge that many thousands of our citizens, especially those who constitute the membership of our churches and synagogues, have protested against the holding of these maneuvers. Great meetings have been and are being held, officials have been visited and thousands of letters and telegrams of protest have been sent. Multitudes of our people, whether connected with the institutions of religion or not, oppose these maneuvers and join us in spirit as we convey to you our assurances of continued and undiminished friendship.

In the spirit of equality and brotherhood we therefore ask you to unite with us in redoubling our

(*Continued on page* 99)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXV MONDAY, MAY 6, 1935 No. 5

THE SON OF MAN

"From His eternal seat
Christ comes down to this earth,
where ages ago, in the bitter cup of death,
He poured His deathless life
for those who came to the call
and those who remained away.
He looks about Him,
and sees the weapon of evil
that wounded his own age,
the arrogant spikes and spears, the slim sly
knives,
the scimitar in diplomatic sheath,
crooked and cruel,
are hissing and raining sparks
as they are sharpened on monster wheels.
But the most fearful of them all,
at the hands of the slaughterer,
are those on which has been engraved
His own name,
that are fashioned from the texts of His own words
fused in the fire of hatred and
hammered by hypocritical greed.
He presses His hand upon His heart,
He feels that the agelong moment of His
death has not ended,
that new nails turned out in countless
numbers
by those who are learned in cunning crafts-
manship
pierce Him in every joint.
They had hurt Him once
standing at the shadow of their temple;
they are born anew in crowds.
From before their sacred altar
they shout to the soldiers, *Strike!*
And the Son of Man in agony cries,
'My God, My God
why hast Thou forsaken Me?'"

—*Rabindranath Tagore.*

The administration's Social Security bill seems to us to be a poor thing. Probably Mr. Roosevelt and his advisors believe in it, the same way that Touchstone loved Audrey—"a poor thing, but mine own"! None the less, we are all for the bill—for one reason, if for no other, that the enactment of the bill will establish a principle or precedent which will remake the life of this nation. It's a case of putting one's hand to the plow, and then not looking back. The exact provisions of the measure, from this point of view, do not concern or even interest us. No conditions of unemployment insurance and old age pensions could be established by the present Congress, or in the present illiterate state of the public mind, which would really mean anything. But the *principle* of social insurance—that is the great thing! At the heart of this bill lies something hitherto unfamiliar in the history of the American people—the idea, namely, that government is ultimately responsible for the economic security of its citizens. In the pioneer stages of our history, this idea was unknown and rightly unknown. There was land for all, and opportunity for every man who wanted to take it. But with the passing of the frontier, and with the coming at the same time of organized industrialism on the farm and in the factory, there appeared a new, and strange, and very terrible world. Suddenly men discovered that as individuals they could not take care of themselves and their families any longer. They were in the clutch of vast impersonal forces over which they could exercise no control. So life became hazardous, even in times of abounding prosperity—and impossible in times of depression and collapse. Hence the challenge to government, by which is meant the political organization of all of us together, to be responsible for each one of us, by guaranteeing and protecting that security which no one can now assure to himself! In Europe, where the frontiers disappeared centuries ago, and where industrialism came far earlier than it did in this country, particularly in England and in Germany, social security measures were long since enacted by government. Now, as a result of the depression, we Americans are learning the lesson, and beginning at least to take some action. Which means that the consequences of the depression are not all loss!

The outcomes of the Stresa and the Geneva conferences justify the judgment of all competent European observers that there is no prospect of war at the present time, or in the near future. The nations are simply not prepared to fight, and thus have found the formulae to stabilize the situation awhile longer. The idea, however, that these agreements mean anything as regards the avoidance of ultimate war and the establishment of permanent peace is too preposterous for words. In essence the European situation is what it has been for years, and present diplomatic moves preserve the status quo today only that it may be the more inevitably broken tomorrow. For the nations desire things which they can

only get through war, or they are retaining things which can only be held through war. If peace is to be saved, then certain nations must abandon certain nationalistic aims, and certain other nations must give up certain nationalistic achievements. Peace, in other words, can be had only at a great price, and it is this price which not one of the armed powers is willing to pay. And so they barter and bargain and achieve nothing but superficial agreements which pave the way, like good intentions, to the hell of another war. Still, it must be regarded as good that time is given us which we can use. This is the challenge—not that we shall be pessimistic and thus give up as though in the hand of fate, but rouse ourselves that, in these next few months or years, things may be done which will make war as impossible in the end as it is improbable at this moment. If ninety-nine per cent of the people of this country want peace, and we believe they do, then why should they not obtain it? If the peoples of the world fear nothing quite so much as war, why should they be forced into what they least desire? Are governments utterly divorced from their citizens? Are we really in the hands of madmen like Mussolini and renegades like MacDonald? Now is the time to find out, we have a breathing spell which can be used, if we will, to establish peace. Economic forces are mighty, political influences stupendous. But we still believe that in the last analysis, man is the master of his fate. Not God wills it, nor governments, but men!

Germany's reply to the extraordinary League of Nations indictment, dictated by France, Italy, and Britain, was commendably mild in tone, and sound in argument. By what right, after all, do these nations question again the sovereign independence of the Reich—the very thing which made Hitler the fruit of Versailles? And who are these nations to denounce Germany for the unilateral repudiation of international engagements? The League Council's resolution of censure declares that Germany 'has failed in the duties incumbent upon all members of the international community to respect contractual obligations." How have the nations which signed this resolution themselves lived up to these duties—England, France, and Italy, for example, in their "contractual obligations" to repay the loans owed to the United States? The Mellon-Berenger war debts contract was a "contractual obligation," and the French Chamber of Deputies repudiated it by unilateral action as long ago as December 14, 1932. Nor can America assume any "holier-than-thou" attitude, for what did we do to our "contractual obligations" to pay our foreign debts in dollars "redeemable in gold?" Everybody can be dishonorable who wants to, but Germany alone must be honorable! Well, this may go down with the pious hypocrites in Downing Street and the Quai d'Orsay, in Rome and in Washington, but it won't go down with the people of Germany, and it won't go down with the historians of the future. The supreme irony of the present situation is that the Reich, in the hands of political gangsters, has a case, and a good case. The situation is much the same as it was in 1914, when attempt was made to place all blame for the war on the Kaiser's Germany. That attempt succeeded—for a time!—but this present attempt to make Germany responsible for this new menace of war, and for the war which may in due course come, will not succeed. What has been done through all these years, from Versailles in 1919 to Geneva in 1935, has been done by the Allied Powers, and upon them must rest responsibility. They sowed the dragon's teeth; and to them belongs the harvest of armed men!

The pacifist movement in this country seems to be coming to life. The arrant militarism of the administration seems at last to be arousing the peace folks to protest, and effective protest, against what is going on. Army Day (April 6th) celebrated with parading worthy of a Nazi celebration, and acclaimed by the President in true Mussolini style, was not allowed to pass without effective pacifist demonstration. The ceremony that day of placing memorial wreaths in the Capitol in honor of Congressmen who voted against the entrance of the United States into the war in 1917, with Senator Norris the honored patron of the occasion, was particularly impressive. The attack of the Federal Council of Churches upon the naval maneuvers this spring was also timely, and produced results. The navy games, we now understand, are to be taken away from Japanese waters, and a goodwill ship is to be sent to Japan with friendly greetings to the government and people. This is a genuine modification of the originally impudent and dangerous program—but why any naval maneuvers at all in the Pacific? Opposition to the appropriation bills, aggregating over $800,000,000 for army, navy, and flying corps this year, has not been conspicuous nor powerful; but may well mount in protest and alarm, even in this day of colossal expenditures, when it is realized that America is setting the pace of armaments. Most significant of anything done by pacifists this year was the students' anti-war strike on April 12th. This uprising of college students in solemn pledge to non-participation in war was a demonstration which war makers well may heed. Lastly, among notable pacifist signs, is the sentiment inside and outside of Congress rolling up behind the McSwain War Profits Bill. What this bill may be in the end, we cannot now say. But, at the hour

of writing, it seems to be on the verge of becoming a sort of carry-all for a multitude of assaults—good and bad, upon the war-machine. Evidently Europe is becoming a ghastly warning again, and pacifism becoming identical with patriotism. The dangers are such compromise on policies as the silly exceptions in the McSwain Bill to use of troops on foreign soil (see below!), such questionable extensions of governmental power as conscription of property, and the vast menace of preparedness which means the same thing here that it does in Germany or Italy.

The McSwain Bill, referred to above, has one illustration of the weakness that seems again and again to dog anti-war legislation—a weakness implicit in confused thinking more than in timid temper. We refer to a proposed amendment to the bill prohibiting the use of military draftees in war on foreign soil—a fine provision!—Except to "repel, prevent, or quell" an invasion of this country. Whether this amendment will be in sight, or even in existence, when this editorial appears we cannot say, but in any case the principle is illuminating. Just look at what this amendment says—that conscripted troops shall not be used on foreign soil except to "repel, prevent, or quell" invasion here at home! But how can invasion of this country be repelled, or prevented, or quelled, or anything else for that matter, by sending troops abroad? If we are fighting Germany, for example, shall we ship an army to Hamburg in order to repel invasion of New York? If we plunge into an armed conflict with Soviet Russia, may be send American conscripts to the Ukraine to fight off a Red invasion of Texas? Is Italy at this moment engaged in defending the sacred soil of the peninsula in sending Fascist troops to Abyssinia? We have been told, to be sure, that the best military defense is an attack. But when is a movement of troops a defense, and when is it an attack? It's the old riddle, all over again, of defensive and aggressive war. As a matter of fact, of course, there is no conceivable distinction between these two things. Which means that the proposed amendment against sending draftees out of the country in war time means just exactly nothing at all. In any future war, American soldiers will go wherever the military authorities tell them to go—to any place on the surface of the globe where their presence will help in the prosecution of the fight, and when they go and where they go will be for the defense of the nation. Pacifists must learn, as well as militarists, that there can be no compromise in this war business. Outlawry must be absolute, prohibitions without exception or reservation. The one true line of policy, after all, is war resistance. *To have nothing to do with war!*

A beautiful illustration of how good news is manufactured, optimistic dope passed out to the people to deceive them into believing that prosperity is still just coming around that famous corner, has come from the house of Dun & Bradstreet, New York. These well known Wall Street purveyors of Pollyannaisms have been consistently announcing in every one of their "Weekly Reviews of Business" since 1929 that everything was going well, and business steadily improving, or about to improve. How business ever managed to go so completely to pieces during these years, with Dun & Bradstreet always saying that things were getting better, each week showing improvement over the week before, is one of the miracles of modern times. It's like the church reports of congregations always increasing, and the pews still empty! Well, some weeks ago Dun & Bradstreet outdid even themselves. Invariably hopeful, buoyant, optimistic, they suddenly became ecstatic, romantic, lyrical. With unemployment unabated, with relief rolls steadily mounting, with wages down and prices up and purchasing power thus less than ever, this is what Dun & Bradstreet said:

> During the week there was a complete transformation of sentiment, as the hopes for a rather far-removed improvement were replaced by a realization that the immediate future is to bring the sharpest rise that has been witnessed in business in the past quarter of a century.

Was there any evidence for this statement? Not the millionth part of an atom. This was just one more bit of the ballyhoo deliberately manufactured by all professional publicity agencies beginning with Washington and going right straight down the line. This is the kind of stuff we are being fed all the time—only in this case a little more so. Some smart office boy, long trained to the business of extracting sunshine out of sour cucumbers, simply let himself go, and thus prophesied "the sharpest rise" in prosperity ever. But this, as it happened, was a bit too much. Even Dun & Bradstreet, experts in foolery, could make fools of themselves. So, a few days later, A. D. Whiteside, president, issued a statement retracting this glowing prophecy on the ground that "no significant information justified" it. All of which means that we now have confession how this recovery dope is doctored and dispensed!

The appearance of Alfred E. Smith as the chief protagonist of the anti-nudist legislation in New York State is a matter of importance far beyond the range of the ineffably silly nudist question. That any considerable group of persons in this age of the world's history, and in a climate like New York, should find it important to give their lives to nudism, is fresh evidence of the immeasurable area of

lunacy among contemporary humans. But we are thinking at this moment not of nudism itself, but of this organized attempt to suppress it. The legislation in question, of course, is prohibition legislation. But "Al" Smith has all his life been opposed to prohibition legislation, at least as applied to liquor! He has declared that prohibition, as it has come specifically to be called, is a gross infringement upon personal liberty, an outrageous invasion of the privacies of the home, and a ridiculous attempt to establish morals by passing a law. Governor Smith and the "wets," in other words, took their stand against Prohibition on grounds of high moral principle. It was not a question of getting liquor—why, many of the "wets" made a great point of the fact that they never touched a drop themselves! But now, on this nudism issue, Governor Smith and others are all for prohibition. They would suppress the nudist camps, just the way the "drys" were suppressing the saloons. But what about this question of personal liberty? How about this matter of invading the home and intruding upon the private concerns of our own individual lives? As for legislating morals into people, isn't this anti-nudist business a perfect example of this procedure? Of course, Prohibition itself—the ban on liquor—never involved any of these questions at all. Getting rid by law of the liquor traffic was no more a violation of personal liberty or a legislating of morals, than getting rid by law of the drug traffic or the white slave traffic. But the "wets" said it *was*, and took their stand on this ground. And now we see how much sincerity there was in it all! "Al" Smith doesn't want to go naked, but he does want "booze." Hence his contradictory action in these two cases!

Stubborn Fallacies

"Something there is that doesn't love a wall; that wants its down." This is the observation of Robert Frost, the New England poet. He made the discovery in connection with the line fence which separated his farm from that of his New England neighbor.

The line was marked by a wall built of cobbles gathered from the adjoining fields, and the wall was forever tumbling down. Every spring he and the neighbor met on a day agreed upon, and repaired the depredations of the winter's frost, of hunters pursuing rabbits and of other machinations which seemed incorrigibly bent upon leveling that wall.

They walked the line each on his own side, painstakingly replacing the stones. The poet grew tired of the labor. What was the sense of a wall there any way? When he raised the question with the neighbor the latter would only shake his head and say, "Good fences make good neighbors." He had learned that proverb from his father, and the philosophy was for him everlastingly cogent.

But, insisted the poet, that was for cows, was it not? Here we have no cows. Apple trees on my side and pines on yours. Surely you do not fear that my apple trees will stray over your way and eat the cones off your pines? "Good fences make good neighbors" was all the fellow had to say in reply, and the wall-mending went on year after year.

There is little rhyme or reason in what is going on among men and nations today. One of the most stubborn of our current fallacies is that preparedness is the way to prevent war, that the nations must arm to preserve the peace. As a two-sided argument there is less than no sense in it; it is sheer idiocy. As a one-sided argument it is a flaming affront, which is precisely designed to stir neighboring nations to retaliation.

If any one of the armed nations is asked, Whom are you arming against? it hastens to make the utterly silly reply, Oh, of course, nobody in particular; we are only preparing for war so that we may insure peace. The neighbors know that nobody can be so dumb as really to mean that, so they proceed in their turn to arm in defense against the menace which they know must actually be intended.

In the calm, judicial atmosphere of editorial offices on this side of the waters the antics of Hitler are being branded as stupid, and his protestations that an armed Germany is the only guarantee of peace in Europe, are blatant hypocrisy. But Hitler's proclamation employs the same logic which is winning army and navy appropriations in Washington, and in every important European capital. The situation goes far to demonstrate that man is not a reasoning animal. His passions and his phobias bring his reasoning powers into such abject subjection that he loses all ability to apply logic.

Another of these stubborn fallacies builds up tariff walls until little or no trade can get over. Their purpose is, of course, to encourage commerce. Everybody knows how dependent each civilized nation has become upon the exchange of goods with other nations. Therefore we line our borders with customs officers to prevent goods from neighboring nations to get through without paying heavy toll, meanwhile hotly denouncing our neighbors because their customs officers are so exacting in the tolls they take upon the goods which our merchants seek to get past their borders.

When these barriers become annoying or posi-

tively prohibitive of commerce, each nation retaliates upon its neighbors by building higher still the barriers on its side of line, to prevent goods from getting through. And all this, mind you, is in the interests of trade, the encouragement of commerce. Protection? Oh, yes, incidentally that; but the ultimate purpose, everybody agrees, must be the extension of trade upon which alone the very life of civilized nations can subsist.

It is small wonder that one of the weightiest problems of modern civilization is the erection and maintenance of sufficient asylums to accommodate the insane. International and much domestic politics are a prolific breeding ground for the insanity which afflicts modern society.

JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE.

Jottings

The late Edwin Arlington Robinson, through many years of his prime, could not earn $600 a year. Edgar Guest, we are told, has many a year made his $60,000. Thus does the rhymster triumph over the poet!

The test of the NRA—whether it is alive or not—is simple. We walked two long blocks in New York the other day, passing more than thirty shops of one kind and another, and saw just two blue eagles signs. The NRA, Washington not withstanding has passed out of the national picture.

These are depression days. Yet, according to the National Recreation Association, 22 cents of every American dollar is spent for luxuries, as against 24.5 cents for necessities. Still today, an average American is spending $4 per average year for candy, $4.50 for soft drinks, $5.10 for cigarettes, $6.20 for cigars, and $7.70 for motion pictures and theatres. The depression is evidently not hurting us very much—yet!

"President Roosevelt Firm on
Bonus Compromise"
Headline in New York *World-Telegram.*

Being "firm" on a "compromise" is a new ethical achievement. A part of the New Deal, we imagine!

The application for membership in Father Coughlin's National Union for Social Justice states that every member must write clearly his own signature "in his own writing *except in cases where the member is unable to write.*" The good Father seems to have a sound understanding as to where the members of his National Union are coming from. Those who cannot write (or read!) are just the ones who would join up.

"Wallace Speaks on Jefferson
Lauding His Ideals."
Headline in *N. Y. Times.*

We wonder how many of "his ideals" Jefferson would recognize in the New Deal administration.

J. H. H.

Unitarianism: Background and Foreground*

Just prior to the world war the winds of the spirit began to blow through Unitarian circles with increasing velocity. The coming of the war for a while turned interest and attention in other than denominational directions. Then following the war the American Unitarian Association began a program of expansion. The Laymen's League was formed and at once became a major power in our organized life. The Alliance, always dependable, increased its resources and activities; and the Young People's and the Minister's Unions became recognized departments of our corporate life. Substantial quantities of money were raised by the various denominational agencies, and what is more important the spiritual resources of our fellowship were energized in a way that had not recently been known among us. As a result of this and other values of our history, we stand today better equipped for a forward movement than ever before. Having overcome the old emphasis upon sectional and provincial matters we should now lift our eyes to the hills of the world and become conscious of a world mission. Our work far from being over, as is sometimes alleged by persons whose hearts are more active than their critical faculties, was never needed more than today both in America and throughout the world. It is high time that we should become conscious of Unitarianism as a necessity in the religious life of mankind.

We need to feel both the urge of antiquity and the pull of modernity. The most radical spiritual mutation has its heritage and is affected by its contemporary world. The lone traveler may be satisfied for a time with the sense of his own daring but soon he welcomes the flickering light of other parties journeying his way.

The roots of Unitarianism go back beyond Christianity to all the great religions as well as to many medieval and modern sects, to various secular struggles for freedom, and to the very beginnings of personal religious experience—that is, to the first efforts of man to enhance and enrich his life by means of whatever power or powers that could be found within or about him.

When the Unitarian refuses to be classed as belonging to a mere sect of Christendom, he is not severing Unitarianism from history, as is sometimes charged, but is recognizing its connection with its to-

*Easter sermon, All Souls Church, Abraham Lincoln Centre, Chicago, 1935.

tal, not its partial history. Whatever glory has belonged to religion anywhere, we claim in our line of descent; and whatever errors of religion exist anywhere, it is our duty to help correct.

Not until the year 325 did the official Christian world abandon the Unitarian principle of individual freedom in religion. True, there were examples of intolerance, but by and large the early church was free and undogmatic. And many groups refused to be officially corraled by the increasing centralization of authority. Witness the Ebonites, a small sect of Jewish Christians living an isolated life East of the Jordan, which retained the original Christian belief in the unity of God, the pure humanity and the natural birth of Jesus until the fifth century. The Monarchians were Unitarians in their insistence that God was only one person as well as one being. The Arians came near rending the early church by their insistence on holding beliefs that resemble Unitarianism and certain types of mild Modernist Trinitarianism. The Anabaptists of Italy, Switzerland, Moravia, Poland, Holland, and Transylvania were essentially Unitarian in their views of the nature of God. Servetus suffered death in Geneva under the reign of John Calvin for holding anti-Trinitarian views. We owe much to Fausto Socinius in Poland and John Huss in Bohemia. And Transylvania furnishes an unbroken line of Unitarian heritage for a period of 350 years. Here in Transylvania, at a time when in other countries heresy was punished by death, a brave young king—twenty-eight years of age—together with his court physician and a young minister, Francis David, gave the people religious freedom. In 1568 the king decreed

> The preachers shall be allowed to preach the Gospel everywhere, each according to his own understanding of it. If the community wish to accept such preaching, well and good; if not they shall not be compelled; but shall be allowed to keep the preachers they prefer. No one shall be made to suffer on account of his religion, since faith is the gift of God.

(I commend this ancient utterance to present-day pulpit committees.) In Transylvania in 1638, the name "Unitarian" became the authorized designation of the anti-Trinitarian church. The name Unitarian was later taken up by the Socinians, and so passed into use in England and America. With the change of political fortunes in Transylvania, the Unitarians suffered many hardships but they have survived in large numbers to this day.

I pass hurriedly to England, for my aim is not to recite history but to suggest a Unitarian world background. The English Unitarian movement was born amid the struggle between the Catholics and the Established Church, between the Established Church and the Dissenters, and among the Dissenters themselves. These ecclesiastical wars had to do primarily with the forms of religion, not its substance. However, there were some who, knowing that the Reformation had not thoroughly reformed the Church, held that doctrines as well as forms should be overhauled. When the act of uniformity was passed in 1662, twenty-five hundred clergymen out of a total of nine thousand in the Church of England refused to conform, and abandoned their pulpits. Other acts of Parliament oppressed the non-Conformists till the passage of the Toleration act in 1669; but even yet doctrinal matters had not received sufficient attention. While Calvinism did not take deep root in the Church of England, Formalism was at its worst. And the Puritans remained strict Calvinists. An act for the burning of heretics dating from 1401 was enforced till 1612. After this the deniers of the Trinity as well as the Catholics were excluded from the benefits of the Toleration act; and the Blasphemy act of 1698 was aimed expressly at anti-Trinitarians. This act was not repealed till 1813.

Like unto Unitarianism are the Brahma Somaj, the Liberal Jewish Movement, and the Ethical Culture Societies.

You recall in America, the real awakening that followed the so-called "Great Awakening" of Jonathan Edwards and Whitfield, the early orthodox attacks on the liberality of Harvard and Yale, the revision of the King's Chapel prayer book, the famous Baltimore sermon of Channing, Emerson's "Divinity School Address," Parker's "Permanent and Transient in Christianity," the Western issue, and the multiple character of American Unitarianism in general—due to constant infusion of diverse theological elements from all the chief ethical and religious movements of mankind.

While there was some connection between these Unitarian movements in the various countries, they were largely indigenous and knew very little of their kindred in other lands. Unitarianism or its equivalent seems to be a faith native to thoughtful people everywhere who seriously contemplate the meaning of life.

When one considers that Unitarians have suffered martyrdom in dungeons and at the stake and have been driven from home and country, one wonders whether the blood of martyrs is in point of fact the seed of the church; for surely there has been sufficient martyrdom to bring forth a harvest greater than has yet been reaped.

For after due allowance has been made for the good work that has been done by individual Unitarians, individual Unitarian churches, and our general organizations, it must still be said that as a movement, and in proportion to what we could do, we are far short of being as large or as strong as we should be. The Disciples Church, which came into being almost simultaneously with the American Unitarian movement, has twenty-five times our number of churches and twenty times our number of members. While size is not the chief consideration, we should remember that we are talking about the number of persons involved and that persons are the chief considerations. With the pressing call of a distressed world ringing in our ears, we must not and cannot be satisfied merely to mark time.

True we are a respectable minority, relatively free to practice and develop our faith without the civil disabilities suffered by the fathers. Joseph Ferencz for more than half a century the Unitarian Bishop of Transylvania was admired and loved by his fellow citizens. In England important offices have been held by Unitarians and other liberals. In America Unitarianism is famous for its names in the Hall of Fame.

Our writings have mightily influenced the religious thinking of the world. With rare exceptions religious freedom is now conceded everywhere. Dr. Charles W. Eliot said that our age is especially marked by the achievement of tolerance.

Individually Unitarians are generally imaginative, venturesome and creative, but corporately we are singularly lacking in these estimable qualities. Individual officials have had policies and have presented them with vigor and wisdom. But corporately we have not kept abreast of our opportunities. We have had no corporate policy of ways or means to develop new parishes at new points or in new countries. We have had no goal in practical matters where small mishaps constantly multiplied lead to disaster. Policies of general impor-

tance are too often determined by chance and without sufficient thought and discussion.

I am far, however, from believing that our present lack of numbers is entirely or even primarily due to interior causes. It is well that we should be severe on ourselves, but it is also necessary that we should be sufficiently objective-minded to recognize that there are exterior causes which cannot be ignored. For example, the idea of supernatural intervention still holds sway in the minds of the vast majority of the people. We often forget how widely this old idea is held. Witness the five thousand who attend the Moody Church, Chicago, every Sunday. I have seen this audience spellbound while the minister told how God chased the devil out of heaven! Folks who believe in a hierarchy of Gods whose ministering angels look after the affairs of men cannot accept the Unitarian teaching of self-reliance.

Theological clinkers abound in the religious fuel of most people, and the will to pry them loose is lacking. Many people find themselves unable or unwilling to rid themselves of the left-overs of beliefs once useful. They cling to the old dogmas when all the values these dogmas ever contained are gone. Not so with Unitarians. We hold no brief for the dogmas of the past. If the past was right, well and good. If the past was wrong, then let the dead past bury the dead. But this loyalty to the present frightens many people who fear the ghosts that may hover around the old theological skeletons. All of this superstition brought down from the dark past stands between us and the majority of the people. With us revelation from beings above has given way to aspiration from within. Intervention has given way to the more dependable methods of evolution. He who will not let go of these ancient ideas does not feel at home in the Unitarian household. We may try ever so hard to welcome him, but he cannot be what he is not.

Also emotional extravagance rather than the same direction of the will still appeals to the vast majority of the people. With most people, emotion, which is capable of becoming a splendid helper, is spoiled by becoming a poor director. Unitarians emphasize the sane direction of the will toward noble ends. We duly appreciate the quiet emotional experience that follows the direction of the will towards noble ends, but we do not depend upon emotion for directive power and we detest emotional extravagance. We think the will should organize and direct instinct and impulse and emotion, not be dominated by them. To fail to organize and direct our emotions towards worthy ends, to live without a purpose, to revel in our feelings is the great sin; but for the majority of people this sin becomes the center of their religion. Little wonder that we cannot reach them.

Intellectual lethargy still characterizes the majority of people. But Unitarianism requires intellectual activity. Thinking is hard work and most people do not like hard work. To accept the creeds as handed down from the past, to accept explanation of the creeds by the church and the clergy, to accept theology in well done up packages is the easy way, and the majority of people prefer the easy way. Because of this both Protestants and Catholics have a distinct advantage over Unitarians. We need not resent the oft repeated charge that Unitarianism is too intellectual. Let us rather see to it that we to some extent justify the charge.

Spiritual camouflage is not distasteful to the majority of the people. They do not think it necessary to change their symbols when they change their thinking. They are willing to be regarded as saying one thing when in fact they are saying quite another. Double meaning is quite common in many pulpits today. Parishioners are in the position of the young husband who said to his bride, "I shall not be like other husbands who get cross and bang things about if the coffee is cold." To which the bride replied, "If you ever did I would make it hot for you." He wondered what she meant. One of the first foundations of Unitarianism is intellectual honesty. The Unitarian idea is not merely to be understood but to speak so that one cannot but be understood. To be willing to be misunderstood is to be un-Unitarian.

Thus you see there are things so fundamentally wrong in the thinking of the majority of the people that they cannot come to us until their thinking is radically changed. And I doubt if their thinking can be changed by arguments or by refutation. People change their thinking not because it is refuted, but because they have outgrown it.

It is my conviction that we Unitarians can best serve mankind and make our best contribution to the life of the world by adhering strictly to two primary matters. The first is *attending religiously to our major concerns,* and the second is *concentrating our energies and resources on a specialized type of missionary activity.*

A major concern is the keeping inviolate of the basic tradition of the Unitarian church.

What is our basic tradition? The answer is simple and the evidence is conclusive. Our church has always stood fundamentally for (1) spiritual liberty and (2) social progress.

There is considerable agitation from time to time for some sort of standard of Unitarian orthodoxy. I understand very well the state of mind of those who seem to feel the need for a spiritual corral. While the Unitarian tradition is against them, practically all other precedents of ecclesiastical history are with them. The very temperament of the majority of the race seems to crave spiritual authority. Notably have slaves in all ages paid little heed to their would-be emancipators. But the tendency of the enlightened everywhere is in the direction of the Unitarian tradition of freedom. Manifestly, therefore, the Unitarian experiment is worthy of loyalty. There are comparatively few religious institutions where freedom is cherished as an indispensable means to noble ends. There are any number of creedal institutions. Those who do not tolerate freedom and difference of opinion should not wreck the Unitarian experiment, but should quietly find their places in the one hundred and eighty-five varieties of the authoritative branch of religion in America.

It requires a high degree of civilization to maintain a fellowship in spite of diversity of opinion. Only a highly civilized man will fight and die for the right of persons to hold opinions with which he does not agree. The Unitarian record on this point is clear. Everywhere have our people been among the front ranks of those who have fought for freedom of conscience. Individual opinions are sacred and must not be coerced. This applies to religion, to politics, and to economics. The obligation to preserve liberty is upon us whether we be called upon to defend the right of a liberal to challenge the authority of the Bible, the church, and the state, or that of a Catholic to pray to

the Virgin Mary. The sacredness inheres not in the content of the opinion but in the right to hold it.

The two outstanding authorities of the early days of Unitarianism in America are Channing and Parker. Their volumes of sermons are surcharged with a social gospel. Everything that concerned human well being concerned them. Abraham Lincoln was mightily influenced by the words of Parker. And in the realm of social service the name of Tuckerman is immortal.

Whenever and to whatever extent Unitarianism holds aloof from pressing human issues, then and to that extent it fails in loyalty to one of its basic traditions.

These traditions should be regarded as sacred and kept inviolate.

A major concern is the enrichment of the tradition of the church. When a movement ceases to move it begins to retrogade. There is no such thing as standing still. We either enrich our inheritance or we become parasites.

Theologically we must grow, or become mere echoes of the past. If we cease being creative we lose the dynamic that belongs essentially to a creative movement.

We have stood and now stand for personal liberty; to this we must add social cooperation. Pure individualism is a myth. Our very souls are socially created. Combination is the method of business; collaboration is the method of science; and cooperation is the method of democracy. I would like to see our churches become laboratories of social experiments. There are inestimable and inexhaustible resources in the craniums of the people, which in cooperative projects are available for human service. From the most unexpected sources great ideas often arise. In the free interplay of free minds is incalculable worth. Hold personal liberty sacred, but to it add social cooperation.

We have stood and now stand for evolution; to this we must add intelligent control of the evolutionary processes. We cannot shift the responsibility for human progress and well-being onto the shoulders of evolution, or of natural law, or of God. It is by the application of human intelligence to the processes of life that we achieve human ends. If we could drive this idea into the consciousness of Unitarians, and make it a familiar part of our gospel, we would be adding mightily to our noble tradtion.

We have stood and now stand for the sacredness of individual opinion; to this we should add a decent respect for objective reality. Opinions should be constantly referred to their proper objective reality and checked for error. This applies with special force to Unitarians. We are rightly respectful of the opinion of others. But this very open-mindedness requires that we, in self defense, constantly take stock of the ideas that we entertain. Prove all things but hold fast only that which is good. In many Unitarian groups are persons who hold opinions all the way from the most crude astrology to the most refined philosophy. We are especially subject to psychological short cuts to knowledge, power, and happiness. And in some instances our churches have sponsored courses of lectures by the high priests and priestesses of the most absurd psychological and astronomical myths. This is one of the prices we pay for liberty; but let us reduce the cost as rapidly as possible.

A major concern is the correlation of the church with the growing intelligence and the social conscience of the world. The need for correlating religion with modern knowledge and aspiration is imminent. There is a chasm between most religious movements and the fields of modern knowledge and aspiration. But spiritual straddling is becoming increasingly difficult. The strain is more than many people can stand. Hence tens of thousands are clinging to the old time religion and letting new time knowledge go, or clinging to the new knowledge and letting old time religion go. Both processes are disastrous. We need to correlate the valid in religion, however old, with the verifiable in knowledge, however new, and so reinforce faith with facts and facts with faith.

On a Saturday evening in a Western city on a down town corner I heard a preacher tell the old, old story of a world created in six days, of sin introduced by the serpent, of the fall, of salvation through the death of a virgin born son, of heaven and hell as places of reward and punishment and of God as a magnificent man. On another corner of the same crossing was a man manipulating a huge telescope through which for the payment of 10 cents you could see clearly the planet Jupiter. This is a symbol of the situation that exists throughout the world. The old and the new are standing apart. One of our immediate goals is to baptize knowledge with religion and to use both in the realization of personal and social aspirations.

Our ministry to persons must be on the basis of modern knowledge and aspiration. It is easy to minister to persons on the old basis of asking and receiving, seeking and finding, knocking and opening; but quite the reverse on the basis of cause and effect, law and order, plan and sequence. It is easy to minister to persons who hope for heaven and are satisfied with rosy promises; but quite the reverse when ministering to people who want to know the truth that they may control their destiny on this planet. Praying is easy, analyzing a complex is difficult. Saying "Peace, be still" is easy; resolving fear is difficult. Promising rewards for goodness is one thing; producing self-validating goods is another. Modern ministry to persons is difficult, but it is possible, necessary, and fascinating.

Our operation in the social life of the world today must be in the light of modern knowledge and aspiration. In dealing with a concrete world a movement whose emphasis is other worldly can postpone decision, defer action, and trust consequences to eternity; but movements such as ours, which emphasize the here and now, must decide between the good and the bad, between the better and best, and must act skilfully with a view to immediate consequences. Such movements as ours must sometimes live dangerously in order that opportunities and duties be not passed by forever.

We cannot always trust the wisdom of the fathers, for we live in a changing world. Purposes and techniques of yesterday do not always fit the needs of today. We must use whatever modern knowledge has for us in the realization of whatever modern aspirations commend themselves to us. We have no special body of knowledge. Ours is the correlated knowledge of all the fields of learning. We have no special technique; ours is the correlated technique of all the sciences of achievement. It is our task to see life in its entirety today, and to strive to make it as a whole what we believe it should be tomorrow.

I am of the opinion that for perhaps the next quarter of a century our missionary activities should be directed along three definite lines. The first is the printed page.

We should flood the cities, villages, and rural dis-

tricts with enlightening modern religious literature. Why is it that Russellism, as it is popularly called, is known to every cross roads in America? Chiefly, I think, because the country newspapers have carried the heretical preachment of Pastor Russell to every crossroads and because the "book cases" of country people have been loaded with Pastor Russell's books at a ridiculously low price. With very little scholarship, with few professional workers, with small means, this movement has flooded America with its teachings. In comparison, how much should we do with the scholarship of the world at our disposal, with numerous writers available, and with adequate resources?

Christian Science is another example in point.

The movement that does not try to reach the mind of Main Street and of the plains of Western Kansas has no future. The populace must be helped to outgrow its dogmas and in performing this task we must have no thought of denominational returns in the way of churches established and adherents counted. If the bread thus cast upon the waters never returns to us its outward flow will still be sufficient justification. One might enlarge upon this question of the printed page. How many of our existing publications serve modern needs? Why should not our imprint be found on some of the great works that are coming from the press of today?

Next to the printed page is the spoken word. A good example was set a few years ago when the Laymen's League inaugurated the campaign of public speaking on religious subjects in some of the great centres of the country. We need a staff of lecturers constantly in the field. Such lecturers should be chosen for their unique equipment for the special type of work involved. They should not be expected to count converts, or to organize churches, or to speak in churches primarily. They should be available for forums, colleges, clubs, universities, and especially the radio. Think of the immense publicity value of the lecture staffs of our friends of the Christian Science and the International Bible Students movements. A staff of popular educators, not mere evangelists, who know their subjects and consequently are able to discuss them so the way-faring man can understand, would be of inestimable value to the Unitarian cause. I mean lecturers who are not afraid to discuss Unitarian doctrine in the most reactionary communities; lecturers who know definitely why we are what we are and how we became so; lecturers who can tell in simple language how we got our Bible and how the doctrines have come to be; lecturers who can portray dramatically the suffering of Servitus at the stake, and the number of "good men in hell." By means of such lecturers and especially when the radio is made use of we could reach many people who now have little or no knowledge of our movement.

Another field for concerted effort is the establishment of churches in strategic centers. We sometimes hear the remark that we have "lost a number of churches," this usually in a critical vein. In truth we should give thanks that some churches are closed and hope that they will remain so. It is true that we need more churches, but we need them in recognized national and world centers from which our gospel can permeate wide areas. A case in point is the establishment of that remarkably successful church in Prague. I have long felt that we should establish churches in certain American capitals, notably Springfield and Columbus. There are others equally promising. Also it is our duty to establish churches in certain of the world capitals, notably Paris, Berlin, Moscow, Geneva, Calcutta and Jerusalem. True this is an expensive program; but the purse of the Unitarian laity will never be opened by small projects. Our laymen are accustomed to big things in business and they will increasingly respond to big things in religion.

A final field for concentration is the making of the Unitarian movement the rallying ground of thoroughgoing religious liberals of all affiliations and of no affiliation. We have not fully appreciated our privilege of cooperating with various kindred groups of the left wing of religious faith. We have thought too much of courtesies extended by the orthodox and too little of the sympathy of heretics who march our way.

In these and many other ways we must actualize our ancient doctrines of progress. Theoretically we are wedded to the idea of progress. The last of the "five points" still holds its place,—the statement that we believe in "the progress of mankind onward and upward forever." It is valid gospel; and we must apply it as never before.

I submit to you that the Unitarian gospel is worth all it costs its believers in isolation, in misunderstanding, in toil, and in sacrifice. Its compensations in promotion of character and elation of spirit, its rewards in personal growth and fraternal sympathy, are beyond compare. Our heritage is great. Our spirit is great. And our future greater still, if we place on the altar of our cause the very best gifts that we have, feeling that no sacrifice is too great for a gospel that rings true to the best impulses and aspirations of the human soul.

CURTIS W. REESE.

"May Day"

I can hear the steady beating of a million marching feet,
I can hear them on the highways and the city's busy street,
I can hear the children singing, and the women and the men,
As they voice the songs of freedom and of victory again.

I can see them raise their banners to the glorious summer skies,
With their heads so proudly lifted and defiance in their eyes,
I can hear them chant the glory of tomorrow that shall be
When the workers of the nations have determined to be free.

I can hear the ominous thunder, see the lightning's angry flash,
As old kingdoms fall in ruin and the ancient empires crash,
I can see new armies rising, red the flag that leads the van
In the struggle of the workers for the Commonwealth of Man.

I can see the new day dawning in a cloudless eastern sky,
I can see the Red Flag flying and the workers marching by,
And I see at last fulfilment of old dreams and prophecy
When the workers of the nations are united to be free.

DON CARLOS.

Memories of William T. Stead

II

It was perhaps in the autumn of this year of the Russian episode that we spent a night with Mr. and Mrs. Stead at their home in Wimbledon, quiet among the trees and with its green garden at the back. It was at any rate at the time when Stead was meditating his "Daily Paper"; and he was very full of this scheme, which proved the most disastrous of his life; although I chiefly remember the talk that night about Cecil Rhodes and Milner, with both of whom he had been closely identified, and with both of whom he had come into such sharp antagonism at the time of the Boer War. Milner had been associated with him on the editorial staff of the *Pall Mall Gazette,* and he had been exceedingly fond of him. "He has sat in the chair in which you are sitting a hundred times," he said, in a tone in which affection lingered, although he had come to loathe everything for which Milner stood. "I sometimes think," he said, "that most of my swans have turned out geese." His affection for Rhodes, to the making of whose reputation and influence he had greatly contributed through his articles in the *Review of Reviews,* was much deeper than his affection for Milner. Indeed, I think he had never gotten over admiring Rhodes, utterly as he came to disagree with him, and the spell of Rhodes' powerful personality was clearly upon him as he talked. The magnificent bigness of Rhodes' schemes appealed tremendously to a mind like Stead's. The admiration had been mutual; and Rhodes in his will had made Stead one of his trustees for carrying out his provision for the scholarships at Oxford, dropping him from the list only when the controversies of the Boer War period showed him how far Stead had moved away from him in his views of political progress and morality. Yet Stead told us tenderly of the last time the big man came to see him, and of his last word as he threw his arms around him:

You may disagree with me, Stead, and condemn me as much as you will, but I shall love you as long as I live.

Stead came to the United Seates in the spring of 1907, and attended the New York Peace Congress in Carnegie Hall in May. It was our first American National Peace Congress and proved to be the largest Peace Congress ever held. The International Peace Congress had been held in Boston in 1904; and that was the largest International Peace Congress in history. I had been the chairman of the Executive Committee for that Congress; and I was the chairman of the program committee for the New York Congress, which I had instigated. Mr. Carnegie, who was a warm friend of Stead's, was the President of the New York Congress; and there was a large number of foreign speakers at the Congress, made possible by the invitation of Mr. Carnegie, who had brought over a large number of scholars for the dedication, as I remember, of his great Institute at Pittsburgh. 1907 was the year of the Second Hague Conference. Mr. Root, who was Secretary of State, came to speak at the opening session, as did also Mr. Hughes who was then Governor of New York. James Bryce and Baron D'Estournelles were among the hundred speakers of the week, a distinguished list; but few there made a deeper impression than Stead, whose speeches were most dramatic. He was full of the idea of organizing an international peace delegation to visit the different governments of the world in promotion of the cause. With this in mind, he came to Boston the week after the New York Congress; and a large meeting of students was arranged for him at the Harvard Union in Cambridge. Prof. Muensterberg took the chair; but as the meeting went on, Stead proposed a resolution or action of some sort, which so disturbed Prof. Muensterberg, that he asked Prof. William James to take the chair, which James cheerfully did and conducted the meeting to a harmless close. Stead was at our home off and on at the time talking things over, and in September we saw much of him at the Hague, where we spent a week during the session of the 1907 Peace Conference. He was there during the whole conference getting out a daily paper in French, with an able corps of assistants covering the proceedings of the Conference, which was of immeasureable value to the members as there was no other current record. His kindness to ourselves was measureless. He sat beside us in the gallery of the ancient Hall of the Knights session at which we were present, pointing out to us the conspicuous members; and we especially remember his taking us to call on Baron Marshall von Bieberstein, the head of the German delegation, at his hotel. Bieberstein was a diplomat of great experience, and his personality was winning and impressive. It will be remembered that bye and bye, he became the German ambassador to England; and he made such an impression upon Mr. Asquith, then the Prime Minister, that the latter said in his published memoirs that if he had lived and remained at his post in London up to the fateful days of 1914, he believed that he alone could have prevented the outbreak of the war. I do not know of any other recognition so memorable and so startling of the accidental character of that terrible catastrophe.

In recalling our relations with Mr. Stead at the Hague in 1907, we can not forget one pregnant and, at the moment startling, word of his in a discussion following addresses by Mrs. Mead and myself at a peace meeting which was one of a series carried on in the city that summer for the education of the general public. I think he presided at the meeting. The discussion somehow drifted into the proper use of the word "Christian" in certain international relations, and there was some strain on the subject. A worthy American ecclesiastic declared that there could certainly be nothing higher than the name of Christ. "There certainly is something higher, brother," interjected Stead, "and that is the spirit of Christ"; and the strain ceased. Stead was one of the most religious men I ever knew. Religion was a controlling factor in his personal life, his home life, and his political life, but he had little patience with anything perfunctory or little.

London was a peculiarly interesting center for people of the international mind in 1908. The International Peace Congress and the International Free Trade Congress met there, and we attended both congresses, which were held alike at Caxton Hall in Westminster. We were at the Windsor hotel close by, along with many delegates both from the United States and European countries. Stead was a frequent caller. We had long been interested in David Lubin and his International Institute of Agriculture and Mrs. Mead especially had written a good deal about it. Lubin was at that time living for the summer at Brighton, and he came to stay at our hotel during the congresses in

order that at odd hours we might talk concerning his great enterprise. One afternoon we invited Joseph Fels, John A. Hobson, and our own John Graham Brooks to our rooms to meet him, but he particularly wanted us to bring him into touch with Stead, and one morning he insisted that Mrs. Mead should drive with him to Stead's office at that hour as it was "borne in upon him" that Stead's help then might be fateful for him. The meeting certainly proved of distinct significance; for Stead, already interested in his effort, was much impressed by him personally, and instantly pulled many London wires for him which were worth pulling.

We chanced to be at Copenhagen, returning from peace work at Christiania and Stockholm in September, 1909, at the momen when Dr. Cook arrived there on his return from his now famous search for the North Pole. His story was taken there at its face value, and the excitement was intense. To be an American in Copenhagen was to have a patent of nobility. We had friends in high places; and we were given a privileged place on the dock where the Crown Prince and the American minister received Dr. Cook. The crowd was immense and to our great surprise there was Stead. He was always likely to be at the point where something signal was doing for the journalistic instinct was always dominant with him. He had rushed from London the moment that the news of Dr. Cook's coming had been flashed. At the moment he did Dr. Cook a good service. He was tall and Dr. Cook was short, and as the excited crowd bore down on Dr. Cook, almost to his danger, Stead threw his strong arms about him and bore him into a neighboring official building, brought him to the balcony and presented him to the frenzied multitude. That evening we were all together at the magnificent banquet given to Dr. Cook by the municipality.

Our last meeting with Stead was in Paris at the beginning of October, 1911. That was an unusually full summer beginning for us with the Universal Races Congress at London in which Stead took a deep interest, and carrying us as far as Budapest where our meetings were arranged by Count Apponyi, whose impending vicissitudes we little divined. We had realized in Germany that the bitterness against England was growing portentous, as we had realized three years before that the English jealousy of Germany's increasing commerce and navy was portentous. The International Peace Congress for that year had been appointed for Rome, but it had been called off on account of the strain between Italy and Turkey on the Tripoli question, and there was merely a gathering of delegates at Berne, at which for the first time we met Norman Angell, whose "Great Illusion" was everywhere being discussed and whom we met again as soon as we reached Paris where he was managing the Paris office of the *Daily Mail* and where we found him like everybody else deeply concerned over the threat of war between Italy and Turky. We immediately found that Stead had come to Paris to confer with influential statesmen there over the issue, and our conferences at his hotel and our drive with him as he went to call on the Turkish and Italian ministers were our last contacts. He was considering an immediate journey to Constantinople and we spent an evening together framing telegrams and concerting preventive measures in Brussells and London. As we took our last drive together and said goodbye he added, pointing upward: "We can only do the best we can and leave the rest with the Senior Partner." Two or three days before he sailed for New York on the *Titanic,* he wrote us that he was coming, and that although he was to stay but a week in America he should come over to Boston to see us. It was to give an address at a great Peace meeting in New York that he was coming. His letter reached us only a few hours before the wires brought the tragic news of the sinking of the great steamship.

EDWIN D. MEAD.

[*The End*]

Will the Senate Put the War Department on Trial?

(Interview with Senator Gerald P. Nye)

Senator Gerald P. Nye, of North Dakota, is the alert chairman of the United States' Senate's special committee of seven now investigating the influence of the commercial motive, and of munitions firms, in stimulating the military activity of governments, especially our own, and in the mysterious genesis of war-scares and of wars. He is a young and a humane man, sincerely horrified at the knowledge that the United States Government permitted approximately one man to accumulate a million dollars or more—to become a millionaire—for every three who acquired a grave in France during our part of the war against Germany, seventeen years ago. Discussing this matter with me, today, in the beautiful hearing-room of the Finance Committee of the Senate, with its pale green marble columns and crystal chandeliers, he made some forceful and highly interesting statements, some of which I may repeat for the benefit of thoughtful readers far from Washington.

"Of all the evidence that your committee has unearthed," I asked, "what developments have surprised you most, Senator?"

He leaned back in the chair, in which he had been presiding at a prolonged interrogation of the profiteering firm of DuPonts, munitions-makers de luxe, of Wilmington, Delaware, whose principal officials had just admitted that their *average* profits during the war-period amounted to $50,000,000 per annum, and that they had some $60,000,000 or more, of accumulated profits, on hand, when the Armistice came, to put a stop to much—but not all of it. Senator Nye leaned back with a tired smile and remarked, after a pause:

"I suppose nothing has astonished me so much as to discover that there is much evidence to indicate that, instead of munitions makers promoting the military activities of governments, governments—especially our own War and Navy Departments—have been actively promoting the industrial and mercantile activity of munitions makers, for years."

"That is the big sensation of the investigation, for you?" I queried.

"I think I had no genuine realization of the fact before," he replied. "The War Department officials have given the munition makers so much encouragement, both at home, and in their dealings abroad, that it is no wonder that Major Casey, of

DuPonts, exclaimed, this afternoon, on the stand, 'We are in this business as long as the War and Navy Departments want us to be, because they consider us a part of the national defense!' . . . That, of course, is their first, and last, alibi."

"Then it appears that to nationalize the munitions industry would only be to do officially and frankly what is now done unofficially and sometimes surreptitiously—is that a reasonable deduction?" I questioned.

"So it seems to me," answered the Senator, with some emphasis. "Of course, it is a grave problem —a problem which we cannot solve in the United States without the collaboration of other nations. But I am sure that we shall have that collaboration. It is we, not they, who have been holding back, and blocking effective international action, for years."

"Well, after all, Senator," I said, "is there so very much difference between the way the munitions makers do business, and the way almost all other so-called 'big' business is conducted? Do not most of them constantly seek the favors of Government, however much they may like to talk, on campaign platforms, about rugged individualism?"

"We are certainly realizing," said Senator Nye, "in this investigation, that we are penetrating the heart of the competitive, profit-seeking business system of the world, and exposing one of the most dangerous and deadly of its aspects."

"Are the munition-makers in a class by themselves, however," I insisted. "Do you regard them as particularly heinous offenders against the good neighborliness of nations, or would they hawk their dangerous wares about the world, if they were not aided and abetted constantly by the war departments to do so?"

"There is no doubt at all," said the Senator, "that the business would not be what it is without the support of government officials. Governments are not only their principal customers and creditors; they are their constant sponsors and patrons. That is why I have stated that our hearings have revealed that certain departments of our Government are co-defendants of the munitions industry and its profiteers, in this great 'trial.'"

"Do you see any possible way of effectuating a divorce between the two?" I asked.

"I do not—except by outright nationalization of the manufacture of the principal implements of war, and of all deadly weapons,—and by 'pitiless publicity,' in Woodrow Wilson's phrase, of the manufacture and strict control of the sale of all munitions, including the aviation and the chemical industry."

"That seems to me a very cogent statement, and almost unanswerable," I replied, after a pause, "with this exception—that I see no assurance that giving a monopoly to the Government of the manufacture of arms, and prohibiting private manufacture and sale, would disarm the world, governments and especially war departments being what they are."

"We shall have much more to say about that, when the Senate convenes," answered the Senator, with a quick smile. "There would be a large gain, certainly, in cutting the profit-nerve in the industry. Governments would hardly engage in foreign selling, or in high-powered campaigns of duplicity for the commercial development of their industry. Government policy can be influenced, or controlled, in democratic countries; and it is interesting to note that the principal manufacturers and salesmen of arms and munitions, the firms that have armed and stimulated the arming of Chinese war-lords, South American belligerents, and Balkan states, are British, French, Italian, Czecho-Slovakian and Scandinavian and American firms—nationals of countries, with the exception of Italy, which are democratic in spirit and organization, and which can undoubtedly collaborate loyally for the suppression of a common menace. I consider this matter the most important of all matters before the world's attention—even more important than problems of domestic recovery from the depression. If we have another war, we might as well give up the struggle for democracy and civilization, and admit that we are barbarians, in a benighted and barbaric age."

"And you have confidence that the Government can be trusted to develop the national defense, without indulging the commercial motive—without permitting interested privateers and profiteers, who have an inside track to the War Department and the Navy Department, to coin the necessities—or alleged necessities—of the nation into ill-gotten gold?"

"I have. The Government already manufactures more than 90 per cent of its ordnance, in its own arsenals. I see no reason why it should not manufacture all of it, including small arms, and armor-plate, and poison-gas, in its own arsenals and laboratories. I see much reason for prohibiting any private individual, or firm, to make, or sell, even a rabbit-gun. These things should all be under Federal license, of the strictest sort, at least. Once we get the manufacture of the things divorced from the possibility of private profit, we shall make some progress towards disarmament, abroad and at home. And not before."

"Will you, then, put the War Department 'on trial,' in the course of this investigation?"

"We are, in effect, doing so. We shall give them an opportunity to explain many of their actions, which have seemed to place the public authority and the Government's own laboratories and supposedly secret processes and formulae at the service of private munitions firms, for commercial exploitation,—including the sale of American patents to such firms as Vickers, the Imperial Chemical Industries, of Great Britain, Japan, and others,—with whom DuPonts, the Electric Boat Company, and other American defendants have been acting in the closest partnership, as the evidence has established, for many years. What we do, and how far we go, in putting a stop to these dangerous practices will depend upon the Senate, and the demand of an aroused public opinion, in supporting this investigation with still more authority and money, in order that the whole truth may be told."

"The public seems to be more interested in this matter than in almost anything that has happened, at Washington, since the War, if I am any judge, Senator."

"Good. The public is right. The importance of these revelations cannot be overestimated. I hope devoutly that public opinion in England, and France, and other countries will assist us, by carry-

ing forward this investigation until it circles the globe. It will be the best of all political antidotes for wars and rumors of war, with which the press is filled. And, if I could have my way, the President would invite an international conference to assemble in Washington, within the next six months to concert joint measures between the representatives and authorities of all the democratic, industrial nations, for the effective suppression of an abominable, and illegitimate traffic. America will go as far as any of them, now. The munition makers, of which Vickers, of England, is by far the largest and most dangerous, are welded in a shrewd international combination for the promotion of business, anywhere and everywhere, without conscience or scruple. Nothing can save us but a joint and collaborative effort of the peoples, for their self-defense against the common enemy and curse of mankind—war, and the profit-system that sustains it."

BRENT DOW ALLINSON.

American-Japanese Relations

Talk of war between Japan and the United States persists, in spite of the fact that such a war would mean suicide for Japan and costly folly for the United States. Jingoists and chauvinists in both countries continue to fan the slumbering fears and hates and the growing jealousies and rivalries. Wars often result from such deliberate fomenting and promoting of the emotional and economic factors out of which wars emerge.

So far as the United States is concerned, the current "Japanophobia" is but the recurrence of an old malady. In 1915 Dr. Sidney L. Gulick, of the Federal Council of Churches, published a book under the title "Japanese-American War-Scare Stories." One of these stories, widely reproduced in the jingoist press, was that there were at least 600,000 Japanese reservists in Mexico, ready at a moment's notice to invade the United States.

In a speech in the United States Senate on March 5, 1934, Senator William E. Borah said:

> The first disagreement I ever had with President Theodore Roosevelt was when a vessel-building program was proposed in the Senate. When I expressed my disapproval of it, I was informed that we were upon the verge of a war with Japan.

Senator Clark, the same day, remarked:

> For the last twenty-five years, at least, every time a big Navy bill came before either the House or the Senate of the United States it was invariably accompanied by propaganda as to the possibility or probability of a war with some foreign power, usually with Japan.

If the two countries keep on preparing for war, at the behest of the shipbuilders and other "patriotic" profiteers, war may become, indeed, the inevitable result of such preparation. Such a war is utterly unnecessary; to allow it to fructify would be supreme folly. Its resultant wholesale slaughter and destruction would mean that our vaunted civilization had retrograded toward the jungle.

In area Japan, exclusive of her mainland protectorate, is less than the size of California, yet those mountain infested islands maintain a population equal to half that of the United States. The total national wealth of Japan in normal times is $20,000,000,000. That of the United States is $321,000,000,000. Our aggregate annual income in the United States normally is over four times the total national wealth of Japan.

Why should two such unevenly matched nations go to war? Owing to technological developments, such a war would not mean an easy victory for the giant opposing the mouse. But why, in any event, should there be any suggestion of settling disputes between the two nations by the method of mass murder or collective homicide?

Only because war is the traditional method of "settling international disputes." Yet history records the fact that "war never settles anything—it merely silences an argument!" But what are the "disputes" between the United States and Japan, that there should be this constant talk of war? And are we both such barbarians—such cannibals—that only shed blood can appease our demands?

As to the *causae belli,* behind the shouting of the war-mongers, there are many cases of friction and hurt national pride; but nothing to warrant turning the Pacific Ocean crimson with the blood of millions, slain on the altar of pride or greed.

Because American shippers desired markets, Admiral Perry opened Japanese ports to world trade. The puny nation thus awakened has become a giant among the "great powers." Even able at times to thumb her nose at all the rest of the world, including the United States of America. But those are the antics of the adolescent, man or nation. At all events, the United States must take the credit—or the blame—for starting Japan on the road to her "place in the sun."

After all the quarrel is not between the people of the United States and the people of Japan. It is a battle between the militarists of Japan and the jingoists of the United States. The military clique in Japan is responsible for all her trouble with the rest of the world. The military ventures in Manchuria and North China—1895, 1904, 1915 and 1931—all were conquests following the precedent of history.

It was the United States' vigorous protests against the "infamous Twenty-one Demands" Japan made on helpless China in 1915, and again our futile objection to the slaughter begun in 1931, that constitute a major item of friction. Yet at no time has America proposed to guarantee the integrity of Chinese territory or her sovereign rights as a nation, by force of arms. In this field we have sought to use the moral weapon of non-recognition of territorial or other gains secured by illegal use of force.

The other items of friction, and the chief "bone of contention" between America and Japan grows out of our Nordic supremacy—White superiority complex. Our Japanese Exclusion Act and other laws, based solely on race discrimination, have grossly insulted the proud Japanese people. They resent being looked down upon as "inferior," especially by the nation that started them on the road to imperial greatness.

Yet only the militarists of Japan want to "fight about it." The people of Japan believe that ultimately the people of the United States will look upon them as brothers. And there are indications that some people in America are growing very much ashamed of our superior airs. Perhaps the depression—the bottomless pit of economic chaos, rather—makes us dimly aware of our own insignificance.

If the Pacific Ocean is to be kept true to its name, then bridges of friendship paved with goodwill must be built between America and Japan. The navy race now under way, plus a continuance of the current war talk, would make war between the two countries inevitable. Shall we not substitute the slogans of peace for the shibboleths of war? Is it not time to stop building warships and begin building friendships.

E. Guy Talbot.

The Disalcohol Conference

I hear from a correspondent usually well informed, but whose name, for obvious reasons, I cannot divulge, that the greatest excitement has been caused in temperance circles by the announcement that the Liquor Trade has decided to hold a Disalcohol Conference in 1936.

The Conference will be attended only by brewers, distillers and wine merchants, but experts will be in attendance, such as inn-keepers and publicans, to advise on technical matters.

It is generally felt among teetotallers that this Conference affords the last hope for temperance, and that if it fails nothing can save the world from unrestricted drunkenness. The prospective chairman (at £5,000 per annum) has aroused the utmost enthusiasm by saying "if the people want temperance they can have it," adding that only the lack of public support restrains the brewers from withdrawing alcohol from beer. He points out, however, the necessity of proceeding slowly and by degrees, and strongly deprecates the policy of total abstinence for individuals, as being certain to produce a lack of security against the others who use alcoholic beverages. He therefore appeals to all Temperance Societies and to the Churches to send in monster petitions to the brewers urging a drastic cut of 10 per cent in the alcohol in beer.

It is understood that the chief subjects likely to come before the Conference are:—

(a) The distinction between offensive and defensive alcoholic drinks.

(b) How to define an aggressive drunkard as opposed to a defensive inebriate.

(c) Temperance security by the collective drink system.

A Parity Difficulty

As regards (a) and (b) the British delegates will insist that "good honest beer" can never be aggressive, but is a defense to the constitution. They point out that since it is good and honest, the more you drink of it the better and the more honest you become, and they point with justifiable pride to the universal admiration accorded to British rule.

They therefore advance the watchword "Beer is Best," and denounce winebibbers from the days of Noah till our own time.

On the other hand the French and Italian delegates declare that light wines are obviously calculated to lighten man's burdens and that beer is notoriously intoxicating and heavy. They regard the case of Noah as exceptional, and as being the reaction from the severe over-dose of water that had recently afflicted the world, so that it was clearly a case of defensive drinking.

Their motto is "Wine that gladdens the heart of man."

Preliminary discussions will take place with a view to exploring every avenue leading to a conference to discuss a formula that will equally express both of these opposite views.

(c) The collective drink system is strongly recommended by the Chairman as the only path to Security. He points out that unilateral teetotalism only leaves more drink to be consumed by those who refuse to be total abstainers, and thereby increases the evil of drink. Moreover he regards teetotalism as being Utopian and impracticable.

Under the collective drink system everyone would keep a good stock of liquor in his cellar so that if one individual should, on the opinion of the majority, have taken his drink in an aggressive manner, the others bind themselves to drink as heavily as they can in order to be able by their intoxicated condition to deal with the aggressor more effectively than they could if sober. It is confidently declared that the mere threat of this collective drinking bout will in most cases be sufficient to prevent any outbreak of aggressive intoxication.

An Historic Ballot

It seems probable that the Conference will last for at least three years, during which time the distillers and Brewers will work at high pressure so as to have an adequate stock of liquor in case of a deadlock or breakdown in the Conference.

In order to prove whether public opinion is in favor of temperance or of drink a temperance ballot will be taken on the basis of the following questionnaire which will be distributed by teetotallers from house to house.

1. Should Great Britain keep on talking about Temperance and all that?

2. Are you in favor of an all-round reduction in the price of drink, by international agreement?

3. Are you in favor of the abolition of those drinks that you do not like?

4. Should the manufacture of beer be carried on for private profit, or more efficiently by the State?

5. Do you consider that if your neighbor drinks too much you should stop him by:

(a) Taking possession of his supplies of liquor.

(b) If necessary, drinking them yourself?

Joseph Southall.

The Scarlet Sage

Beyond the green crest of my neighbor's hedge,
Racemes of vivid scarlet in the sun
Seem marching like silk flags furled on their staffs,
To lilt of far-heard trumpets on the breeze.
Perhaps when Tancred or King Lion-heart
Came home from the Crusades, his ensigns burned
Above thronged streets with marvel of this hue.
And now through eyes beholding its array,
In first clear sunlight after leaguering storm
That flailed an Autumn week with harsh-blown rains,
The color with its sheer intensity
Heals some deep need and grayness of the soul.
Against a Summer thunderstorm's dark clouds
Retreating from their hour's fierce control,
The rainbow's victory arch glows exquisite;
But to emblazon close of longer siege
That seemed to whelm the waning year in gloom,
This dazzling shrub shall lift the triumph sign,
And win full merit of its other name—
Salvia splendens—banner, bugle, flame!

Eliot White.

The Study Table

Indian Nationalist Opposition to Imperial Preference in India

India is one of the great industrial regions of the world. Importance of India in the field of international trade and commerce is only next to the United States of America, Great Britain, Germany and Japan. With the population of 350 millions and the raw materials available in the country, India should have developed her industries more effectively.

"With all the advantages, India, after a century, was supporting only about two per cent of population by factory system. . . The country is still annually importing far more manufactures than it exports. While the proportions are gradually changing, Indian economic life is still characterized by the export of raw materials and the import of manufactures. *In spite of her factories and her low standard of living, India is less nearly self-sufficient in manufactured products than she was a century ago."* This is the view of Prof. Dr. Daniel Houston Buchanan, expressed in his exceedingly valuable work "The Development of Capitalistic Enterprise in India," p. 451.*

This retardation of progress of economic development of India, under the British rule is the result of the economic policy pursued by the Government during the period of more than a hundred years. In substance the British economic policy regarding India has been this:

"Instead of attempting to encourage and develop in India an efficient factory industry, such as was built up during the same period in the United States, Germany and Japan, the British kept India as a supplier of food and raw materials and as a market for her great manufacturing industry." p. 459.*

At the outset the British rulers of India naturally followed the policy that whenever the interest of Indian industry clashed with that of British industry and trade, the latter must be upheld at the cost of the former. This policy was followed in taxing Indian products, by offering 'free trade" to British goods to India and by refusing to protect Indian industry by tariff. It has been generally preached by the British officials and economists that the British followed the policy of *laissez faire* for India, because this policy served the British interests best.

Prof. Buchanan points out: "The policy of the Indian government was long avowedly that of free trade, *which maintained the Indian market as one of the most valuable outlets for British industry and trade."* Only in recent War and post-War periods, and then only in response to very urgent demands for revenue and great agitation from Indian community, was a measure of protection granted." p. 464.

The nature of Indian criticism of British economic policy in India may be understood from the following extracts from the minute of dissent presented by five Indian members of the Indian Fiscal Commission appointed by Secretary of State for India in March, 1921:

"We believe that the industrial backwardness of India is in no way due to any inherent defects amongst the people of India but that it was artificially created by a continuous process of stifling, by means of a forced tariff policy, the inborn industrial genius of the people. . . If a policy of protection had been adopted, say at least a generation ago, if the same freedom to regulate her fiscal policy had been conceded to India as was conceded the self-governing Dominions, India would have made by this time great progress in the direction of industrialization. . ." (British Parliamentary Papers, 1922, Session 2, II. Cmd. 1764).

Since the outside competitors (Japan, the United States of America, Germany, Italy, etc.) entered the Indian market the British policy readily changed or shifted to one of "discriminating protection for Indian industry" and "Preference for her own Trade." But as the Indian people do not enjoy full control over Indian fiscal policy Great Britain is still using India as a field for her special interest, by enforcing "Imperial Preference."

Imperial Preference enforced upon the people of India is a great drawback to the cause of industrial development of the country. It not only discriminates against other nations than the British in carrying on trade in India; but it makes Britain practically the preferred middle-man in matters of international trade of India. The Indian Merchants' Chamber of Bombay published a memorandum on the subject and I shall quote a few more important objections against imperial preference.

"The Agreement (based on imperial preference) will perpetuate and extend further the present dominant position of Britain in the trade of India. This is against the very economic axiom, that to be able to get the best advantage out of international trade, a country must needs have large trade relations with the largest possible number of countries as buyers and sellers,—in other words, the widest possible markets and the widest possible sources of supply. *Besides, the consequent strengthening of the economic domination of Britain will only serve to perpetuate and stiffen the political domination.*

"The Agreement initiates a policy of industrial cooperation between Britain and India, which will reduce India to the position of manufacturing semi-finished articles and the Indian tax-payer will be called upon to pay in order that the British manufacturers may have the benefit of turning such articles into finished products for the Indian Market.

"The Agreement, in increasing British imports into India and diverting some of our exports to Britain, will only help to tighten the stranglehold of British shipping to the detriment of our own.

"The Agreement will seriously prejudice the growth of Indian industries in those articles in which British goods are to receive preference, and many a nascent industry in any of these articles, at any time in future, proves its case for protection, protection will be given only on the basis of preference to British goods, as already done in the case of Steel and Textiles."

One of the greatest objection against the Imperial Preference Agreement, made between India and Great Britain is:

"The Agreement is not based on the principle of reciprocity, because whereas the United Kingdom is likely to get a substantial benefit in the Indian market, India's advantage will be very little, if any at all. . ." (The Indian Merchants' Chamber, Views of the Committee on the report of Indian Delegation to the Imperial Economic Preference, Bombay 1932, pp. 23-25).

The welfare of the people of India, especially the

*"The Development of Capitalist Enterprise in India," by Daniel H. Buchanan. Macmillan Company. New York. 1934. This work was sponsored by "Bureau of International Research," Harvard University and Radcliffe College. It is a valuable contribution on the subject.

masses, depends very largely upon national prosperity of the country. Economic development of India, industrialization of the country must play an important part to achieve this end. From the economic history of other lands, especially the present economic history of Japan and Russia, it is evident that economic development of a country depends very largely on the policy of the government of the country.

It is quite evident that the fiscal policy of the British rulers in India has not been in favor of the developments of Indian industries which might compete with British trade monopoly in India. Grudgingly, owing to peculiar circumstances—political unrest and international situation—some concessions have been made to the Indian people which may be of some help to the development of Indian industry; but fundamentally the British fiscal policy in India remains unchanged: Preference to British interests and not equal opportunity to other competing nations. This policy will continue to control Indian economic development and her commerce, unless the Indian people can secure full and complete fiscal autonomy of the country.

Indian nationalists, while demanding the right to control the fiscal policy of the country, are opposed to British monopolistic commercial interest in India and they are in favor of commercial reciprocity. Therefore every nation interested in "equal opportunity for trade" in India has interest in the success of the Indian nationalist cause.

TARAKNATH DAS.

"The Woman Without a Country"*

A well written work in which the need for civilized legislation or inter-racial matters is woven delicately into a story ranging from the simple campus of an old college town to scenes in South Africa and India, Great Britain and Russia. In the background is the tragedy of a world in which social values have not kept pace with the physical developments that bring the world together and in the foreground is the dawn of better racial understanding and relationship.

The author is a New York lawyer who has spent a major portion of his life helping others. The hero is an East Indian; the heroine an American,—both fine products of their respective cultures. The book, true to fact, closes with the lovers kept apart by uncivilized marriage and citizenship laws.

CURTIS W. REESE.

*"The Woman Without a Country," by Melbert Cary. Published by Meador Publishing Company, Boston. 308 pages. $2.00.

Correspondence

Prevent War With Japan

Editor of UNITY:

The Japanese Exclusion Act is the principal cause for war with Japan. Our official classification of orientals as undesirables is a direct insult to the Japanese and is keenly resented by them. The unfortunate revision of the United States statutes in 1924 was entirely uncalled for as Japan was living up to its agreement to restrict emigration to this country.

This *casus belli* is so clear, so definite, so easily removed that every lover of peace should do his utmost towards its elimination. The abrogation of this unjust discrimination would not materially increase the number of Japanese who could enter the United States, for they would be limited by the general quotas which apply to all nationals. It would create a friendly relationship that would make the presence of a fleet in the Pacific Ocean unnecessary. Reciprocal trade would increase.

In order to arouse public opinion in favor of an act, both of justice and expediency, we suggest that all internationally minded persons and organizations petition Congress and the Department of State for the immediate repeal of the Japanese Exclusion Act.

Will you kindly advise us if such action will be taken by you and if you consider May 30th an appropriate date for a joint effort that will obtain wide publicity.

PEACE PATRIOTS.

114 East 31st Street, N. Y. C.

Scottsboro Decision Does Not Degrade Jury System

Editor of UNITY:

Some editors miss the point of the Supreme Court's Scottsboro Decision in one or two particulars:

1. The Court did not decide that Negroes who are unfitted for jury service, or anybody else unfitted for jury service, should ever be placed on juries. It decided that Negroes who are fitted for jury service should not be excluded from jury panels, from the venires. It is well known that there are many Negroes in every southern community far better fitted for jury service than are many of the whites who are actually put on juries. This evidence was presented to the court in the Scottsboro cases: the defense counsel had a great list of Negro college graduates and substantial citizens in every sense of the word,—and yet showed that no Negro had even been put on the list of prospective jurors for fifty years or more. In short, the Supreme Court was shrewd enough to see that these educated and reputable Negroes were left off the panels *to keep them from getting on the juries.* If they had been in the panels, in many cases, where Negroes were being tried, it would have been impossible to keep Negroes off the jury, because many of them would have stood head and shoulder above most of the others in the panel.

2. Take notice: that the Court did not say that Negroes must be placed on juries at all; after Negro names are placed on the jury lists, they are still not on the juries, and if they can be shown to be incompetent when the jury is being made up and the prospects are being questioned, they need never be on the juries,—and the law would be fulfilled in that Negroes would not have been absolutely barred by not even being placed on the panels. The very fact that, as in the Scottsboro case, the white officers were afraid even to allow Negroes to be tested for jury service, shows that they believed some of the Negroes would stand the test. That is the irregularity that the Court ruled unconstitutional.

All that the south has to do is to summon Negroes to be tested for jury service, and if they are incompetent, to leave them off the juries. But that is exactly what the south does not want to do. To require only the same qualifications of Negroes that are required of the whites will bar the great "unfit masses" of the Negro race, but will open the door to the large well-fitted minority of that race. That is what the south does not want to do; that is what the Supreme Court says must be done, if the trial is to be okayed by the great Court.

WILLIAM PICKENS.

New York, N. Y.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 82)

efforts to maintain our historic friendship and in opposing every effort that is likely to lead to mistrust between our peoples. Together let us move forward in peace and justice to greater service to humanity, weaving the broad seaways of the mighty Pacific into unbreakable bonds of unity in the world community.

Sincerely yours,
W. Russell Bowie
S. Parkes Cadman
Edmund B. Chaffee
Allan Knight Chalmers
Sherwood Eddy
Harold E. Fey
Harry Emerson Fosdick
John Haynes Holmes
Paul Jones
Rufus M. Jones
Francis J. McConnell
Kirby Page
John Nevin Sayre
Ernest Fremont Tittle
E. Raymond Wilson

The Churches on War—Unemployment—and a New Social Order

(Concluded)

(See last issue for detailed pronouncements of Protestant, Catholic and Jewish bodies.)

Here speaks, with authority, the united voice of religion—unquestionably the most potentially powerful force in the life of a nation. It denounces war and the war system; asserts that "the right to regularity in employment is co-equal with the right to regularity in the payment of rent, in the payment of interest on bonds" —to use the language of a U. S. Supreme Court Justice; and arraigns the present competitive system of industry, supplementing it with a demand for a new social order based on service, not on private profit and personal gain.

Its effect upon the political and economic institutions of our country in the past have been negligible because these pronouncements and demands have not been followed by organized action in the political field.

Already there is ample evidence in the public press that the defenders of the economic (1929) status quo are out in the open in their demand for a return to the old order of things—the "American System," so-called. Whether it is the recently organized American Liberty League, the directors of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, or the Federal Advisory Council (composed of leading bankers) sending formal, although we are told, extra-legal advice to the Federal Reserve Board, the main tenor of their activities and pronouncements is the same, viz: a defense of property rights, a demand for less Government in business, and an attempted recovery to be brought about by the operation of "natural economic laws."

What such upholders of the present economic order cannot yet accept is the obvious fact that this is not a depression from which we are to recover; not *a* crisis to muddle through; but, as has been said, *the* crisis, like other great historic upheavals, from which the world can emerge peacefully only by consciously planning a new social order. We are witnessing in the breakdown of Capitalism not, necessarily a destruction of civilization, but the dawning of the long-prophesied and hoped for social and industrial order envisioned by philosophers and economists as the "Cooperative Age," and by religious prophets and seers as the Kingdom of God on earth.

Let us not fear, but welcome the passing of the old day and the birth of the new.

And in America, where political democracy was born only 150 years ago, the people are now called upon to create by a series of Federal emergency enactments the new Cooperative State, thereby demonstrating to themselves and to the world that fundamental changes in economic and industrial society *can* be worked out without the historic accompaniments of social disorder and bloodshed.

We are now at the cross-roads of our social revolution. Old values and forms are fast disappearing, and their return should not be sought.

For the first time in the history of the world we are offered the economy of plenty for all, if we will but recognize it and build the new forms in which it can effectively and smoothly function.

The time in which to publicly discuss and consider this new society is short. In the hands of the new Congress may be the privilege and responsibility of drafting and enacting the necessary laws to initiate the new financial and industrial mechanism. To supplement and, indeed, to authorize this legislation there must be an informed and aroused electorate who see the necessity for the New Order. The emergency police powers of the State, invoked in such a time of stress and danger, are ample to deal with the present crisis; and the constitutionality of these powers has recently been reaffirmed by the U. S. Supreme Court in two well-known cases.

Will the forces of religion, social work and education now join with other forward-looking groups of the country in their demands for social justice and a warless world?

Obviously the first act of these bodies should be the organization of a National Convention at Washington—with conventions in other pivotal cities—at, or about, the convening of the new Congress for the purpose of asserting, in the words of President Roosevelt, "the right to demand of the government of their own choosing the maintenance and furtherance of a 'more abundant life.'"

Surely the first two requisites of the "abundant life" are the abolition of war and the abolition of unemployment and poverty.

DARWIN J. MESEROLE.
October, 1934

Free America

Bitter experiences have been encountered by Rev. Ward H. Rodgers, a graduate of Boston University School of Theology in the class of 1933, since his graduation. The daily papers have recently carried press dispatches from Arkansas telling of his arrest in connection with the holding of a mass meeting, of which he was chairman, at Marked Tree in that state. In a communication to his former teacher, Professor David D. Vaughan, Mr. Rodgers gives his version of the case. The letter reads in part as follows:

County Jail, Harrisburg, Ark.

I resigned from my circuit near Subiaso, Ark., last May and came to this part of Arkansas, working with the Socialist Party. In July we organized the Southern Tenant Farmers' Union, Inc. I was active in organizing the union until late October. Then I accepted a job with the FERA Workers's Education, and spent six weeks at the University of Texas studying under the supervision of

the governor. For the past seven weeks I have been teaching workers' education to members of the S. T. F. U. Three of the classes were white, two were Negro.

Last Monday, Jan. 14, 1935, my class of Negroes at Dubb near Tyronza, Ark., was interrupted and investigated by the Tyronza school board and superintendent. They objected to me, a white man, teaching a group of "niggers." They objected to my membership in the Socialist Party. They objected to the presence of copies of the *Southern Worker,* published in Birmingham, Ala.

The next morning I went to R. A. Lynch, superintendent of schools of Tyronza, and tried to straighten things out. He said that if I went ahead I would have no students, and he smiled. When he saw that I was not afraid he said, "Get out of town or a committee will see you out." I asked him if that was not Ku Klux Klan methods. He said, "Yes." After talking on the economic conditions we parted.

I went immediately to H. L. Mitchell and told him the story. In the afternoon we had a mass meeting at Marked Tree, 800 strong by one o'clock in the afternoon. I was chairman. I was the fourth of seven speakers—three were Negroes. I introduced them all as "mister." This meeting was on the public square.

I was arrested after the meeting, on four charges, two felonies and two misdemeanors. The felonies are: inciting a mob, and conspiracy to overthrow the Government; the misdemeanors: anarchy, and using profane and abusive language. A habeas corpus last Saturday set bail for the felonies at $1000 each, total $2000.

Yesterday, Monday, Jan. 21, I was tried for anarchy in justice of peace court at Marked Tree. I had the local American Civil Liberties Union lawyer, C. T. Carpenter. We didn't have a chance. The jury was packed. I was found guilty of anarchy and fined $500 and given six months in jail. We have appealed the case to the circuit court in March. They dropped the misdemeanor charge of profane language, lack of evidence, today. I do not know what my bond will total to, around $3000. Our greatest difficulty will be raising bond.

I resigned from my charge, but not from the church. Henry R. Mills, the district superintendent, is still my friend. His address is 324 14th Street, Little Rock.

It is my personal opinion that all of these anarchy laws are unconstitutional. But then FERA Workers' Education requires that we present all points of view, political and economic. My room has been searched for "red" literature.

I shall be tried for "inciting a mob," and "conspiracy to overthrow the Government," at a later, unknown date.

I have not heard whether the American Civil Liberties Union has officially backed the case yet or not.

Certainly this young man should have the support of all good citizens in his effort to meet the charges made against him, which appear largely to grow out of his friendship for the workers suffering injustice and the Negroes whom he has been endeavoring to teach.

—*Zion Herald.*

Religious Liberty in Mexico Petition Signed by 500 Clergymen

"The undersigned Protestants, Catholics and Jews of the United States wish to express their conviction in regard to the necessity of the achievement and the maintenance of religious liberty in all lands. We are especially concerned at the present juncture over the situation in Mexico where many unprejudiced observers report that in the endeavor to achieve social justice and political reforms otherwise desirable, religious liberty is being imperiled. We register our alarm at every restriction upon the right of the churches to function, and the rights of individuals to practice the religion of their choice.

"Recognizing that freedom from religious and racial intolerance is not fully achieved in the United States, and in other countries of the world than Mexico, we acknowledge our responsibility to labor for its achievement everywhere. While refraining from discussing the immediate issues at stake in the controversies in Mexico, we desire to give our moral support to those who labor for freedom of worship there, and to express the anxiety with which we view every threat to liberty of conscience and the freedom of the soul."

The announcement said: "In view of the fact that 95 per cent of churchgoers in Mexico are of the Catholic faith, the National Conference leaders invited Protestants and Jews to take the initiative in this petition. Over nine-tenths of the signatories are Protestant ministers and Jewish rabbis, the remainder being Catholics. The signatories represent twenty-six Protestant and three Jewish denominations in forty-one States and Canada."

Faith

However young or ag'd our frame,
However great our wealth or name,
Lord, you are Father of us all,
And we are but your children small.

Like curious children, we explore
And open many a wond'rous door
To other doors, but not our goal—
The master-mystery of soul.

With childish faith, without a care,
At night we smilingly prepare
Ourselves in dreamless sleep to lay,
Until you waken us next day.

JEROME ALEXANDER.

THE ARBITRATOR

For sixteen years this petite peppery paper has offended some of its readers each month by its truthful exposition of the news. It has no axe to grind; it is not dull. It is for the under-dog and snappy.

The editor has written "The Mistakes of Jesus" to demonstrate the improvement in ethical, social and religious standards since the first century. Price $1, to include a year's subscription to The Arbitrator which is 60 cents.

114 East 31st St., New York City

STARTLING FACTS
SUPPRESSED BY OTHER PAPERS ARE BEING EXPOSED NOW IN
LA FOLLETTE'S
GREAT NATIONAL WEEKLY NEWSPAPER
Regular Price $1.50 per year
The Progressive
Get the true facts from an authority.
Special Offer 3 Months (13 Issues) 20c
Send 20c Today for Next 13 Sensational Issues
THE PROGRESSIVE, DEPT. 44, MADISON, WISCONSIN

The April-May Issue of

The New Humanist

contains

MAX C. OTTO
"John Dewey's 'Common Faith'"

UNEMPLOYABILITY—A MEDICAL PROBLEM
Bernard Fantus
INTELLECTUALS UNDER FASCISM
C. Drevet
REGIMENTATION AND LIBERTY IN AMERICA
Robert Weston
ERASMUS INTERROGATES FATHER COUGHLIN
Harold P. Marley
SPRING NOCTURNE—A POEM
Mildred Hardcrest
HEBREW HISTORY SECULARIZED
F. H. Hankins
ARE WE SPIRITUALLY BANKRUPT?
Max Kaufman
THE GROUNDS OF GOOD GOVERNMENT
L. M. Pape

Free with each new subscription, any *one* of the following books, postpaid: HUMANIST SERMONS, edited by C. W. Reese; HUMANISM AND NEW WORLD IDEALS by Oliver L. Reiser; HUMANISM IN RELIGION EXAMINED by Robert J. Hutcheon; HUMANIST RELIGION by C. W. Reese.

Yearly $1.50 *Per Copy* 25c
Canadian & Foreign $1.75

Raymond B. Bragg, Editor
Edwin H. Wilson, Managing Editor

Published six times a year by
THE HUMANIST PRESS ASSOCIATION
330 South Dearborn Street, Chicago